

# Waste Reduction Task Force

---

## Third Meeting –December 4th, 2007

### Meeting Summary

The third meeting of the Waste Reduction Task Force took place at the TDEC Fleming Training Center in Murfreesboro, TN on December 4<sup>th</sup>, 2007.

After a call to order, review of meeting rules, objectives, and some housekeeping issues; the meeting began. Don McCain reviewed the days agenda pointing out that the focus was going to be on a review of Construction and Demolition programs and options that are available for consideration. Also, composting was going to be touched on by several presenters.

Dr. Richard Buggeln from the University Of Tennessee Center Of Industrial Services was introduced and spoke on the history and background of construction and demolition in Tennessee. His presentation recapped what was accomplished and agreed to by previous task forces and summarized what was going on around the county.

In the next segment of his presentation, he discussed the uses of construction and demolition materials being used on site as opposed to transporting to a processing facility. In recent years the University of Tennessee Center for Industrial Services provided onsite workshops to the construction sector showing how many materials like shingles, bricks, gypsum board, wood and other materials can all be used on site for various tasks. They have also done research on the use of gypsum board and MDF as soil amendments with great success on farms.

Nick Lytle with the Department presented again a presentation on material collected about the implementation of a construction and demolition deposit system that would encourage the recycling and diversion of material from Class III/IV landfills. This system is based on a system that the State of California has implemented and provides an option to local governments to help divert usable construction and demolition material away from disposal processors.

Nick Lytle then presented a summary of the recently submitted joint Tennessee State University/Middle Tennessee State University study on construction and demolition and organic waste study analysis. He said that he would make these available in PDF form on the website for review as it is extensive and his was just summarizing the material and the findings.

The next speaker was Tiffany Wilmot who made a presentation on the deconstruction of buildings. Her company worked with the Titans organization and the City of Nashville to deconstruct many old building prior to the construction of the new LP field. The efforts of her company saved nearly 50% of the cost of disposal. The same practice was used on many army base buildings that were being deconstructed. Her presentation showed the various layers that need to be gone through in the process of deconstructing to be successful. Her presentation will be placed on the website for further review.

Dr. Richard Buggeln again presented this time on the History of Composting in Tennessee.

The Task Force after a brief break to pick up lunch and make calls had a working meal. Each work group then presented to the Task Force summaries of the work they have been completing. Each group was to start prioritizing their working topics and bring back to the Task Force. The following is a brief summary of their discussions:

#### Work Group -1

1. Clearly define reasons we are considering change
2. Development of a method to isolate waste groups
3. Find ways to increase services without increasing money needed
4. Full Cost accounting both financially and environmentally
5. Strive to limit transportation of materials

#### Work Group – 2

1. Do we want to continue reporting both public and private numbers in the APR
  - a. Private program data can not be gathered with accuracy especially with urban regions
  - b. Option 1 Do nothing
  - c. Option 2 Counties only report what they can control
    - i. Waste reduction recorded only on what county does
  - d. Option 3 Draft legislation that requires industries to report waste stream
  - e. Option 4 Hybrid method, counties can choose whether they want to report combined or report non-combined.
2. How do we make industries report
3. How can information be kept confidential, can this be done?
4. How do we avoid double counting.

#### Work Group -3

1. Has there been any change in the planning board role
  - a. Boards have become less active
  - b. Base requirements for meetings, agendas, waste reduction standards
  - c. Board use to create long term plans, tend to just deal with yearly compliance
2. Does the planning board composition need to change?
  - a. Certain number of solid waste officials
  - b. Divide boards into two committees, one with planning, one with technical
  - c. Make board more technical oriented.
3. Can non-government managed waste be brought into solid waste reduction initiatives?
  - a. A large deal of waste can not be considered for waste reduction because government has no control
4. Should change be made to make all accountable for goal, not just regions?

#### Suggestions:

1. Municipalities of more than 4000 would have to prepare solid waste plans
2. Paint- Should paint companies exhibit product stewardship, ... be responsible for paint?
3. Allow time after taskforce meeting for Workgroup meetings

4. Stay focused
5. Some large multi county regions are too big. 10 county region, etc. Should all large population counties be single county regions?

#### Work Group -4

The following is how this work group prioritized the questions that came under Infrastructure and Financial Development.

1. Possibility of elimination of some matching in recycling rebates
2. Issue 1: Tire grant running out of money
  - a. Get counties out of the tire business
3. Issue 2: Financial Accountability
4. Issue 3: Awards and Rewards for Local Governments
5. Issue 4: Educate the public leaders of financial and infrastructure needs
6. Issue 5: Make priorities on these issues
7. Issue 6: Educate those eligible for the grants
8. Revolving loans for solid waste was removed as a priority and should not be looked at further unless the circumstances dictate or change.

Other priorities include:

- Review previous grant awarded
- New Pilot grant programs
- Create reporting back for grants
- Create New Markets
- Best Management Practices
- Address Infrastructure needs and shortfalls
- Cooperative agreements (interlocal agreements) between rural county solid waste programs
- Markets need to drive cooperatives rather than legislation to make them successful and able to adjust to the ever changing market.

After all groups presented Don McCain asked that prior to the next meeting the groups would take their recommendations and use the following model to draft their recommendations.

1. Align recommendation to objectives
2. Advantages and Disadvantages (Pros & Cons reviewed)
3. Resources required to put in place
4. Cost/Benefits
5. Obstacles and barriers along with Tactics to overcome
6. Implementation Actions

After reviewing the meeting and setting a date for the next meeting the Task Force was adjourned until the next meeting to be held January 23, 2008.